

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14-17, and 20-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 10-11, 14, and 21-23 were amended; claims 2 and 12 were canceled. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has stated that claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 14 and 21-23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, the claims have been rewritten to overcome this objection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the features of claim 2. Since claim 2 was found to be allowable if rewritten, amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Applicants have amended claim 11 to incorporate the features of claim 12. Since claim 12 was found to be allowable if rewritten, amended claim 11 is believed to be allowable.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Erickson, Centrally coordinated Communication systems with Multiple Broadcast Data Objects and Response Tracking*, U.S. Patent No. 6,014,644, dated January 11, 2000 (hereinafter referred to as "*Erickson*").

Because amended claim 1 incorporates the features of allowable claim 2, and amended claim 11 incorporates the features of allowable claim 12, claims 1 and 11 are believed to be allowable. The remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or claim 11 and are also believed to be allowable. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 5-6, 11, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Erickson* as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of *Heinzel et al., Alert Notification Engine*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0225718, published November 11, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as "*Heinzel*").

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Claim 17 depends from claim 11. Because claims 1 and 11 are believed to be allowable, claims 7 and 17 are also believed to be allowable. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B.Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants